



December 14, 1998

Theodore J. Kaczynski  
04475-046  
P.O. Box 8500  
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

Thank you for your letter of December 4, which arrived on Friday. I apologize for the delay in getting back to you, but there has been more work than usual as of late.

I enjoyed the lesson on Latin prefixes, and I blushed for my mistake. Extravert will stand. Thank you also for pointing out my error regarding the quaking aspen. I look forward to getting more pictures when they come in from Sacramento. I liked the picture of Old Baldy, but there is not enough color contrast to reproduce it in an insert (which is I why it is enclosed). I do want to run a picture of Old Baldy, so I will contact \_\_\_\_\_, explain the contrast issue completely, and see what she comes up with. Thank you for the letter of reference, which I will send to her. The directions to your property were excellent, and unless I am mistaken, I found the gulch in question without a hitch! Per your request, I will return all of the photos when I have made selections. I am returning some now (enclosed), since Ulveman has given me duplicates.

Michael Ulveman (I spelled it incorrectly the last time) has taken pictures of other structures on your property. One appears to be a root cellar. The other structure is comprised of a rectangular roof on four poles that measure eight to ten inches in diameter and two longer poles that run length-wise at gentle angles presumably for stability. There is also a picture of a metal folding chair with three "gutters" stamped into the chair back for ornament. It is rusty and appears to have been blue or green. The right hinge is broken. There is a white enamel pot with black handles next to this chair. Ulveman has also included a photograph of a red bicycle frame (another metal part leans against the frame). Two tires hang over the tail fork. The frame is in good condition. I would like to know if any of these pictures have been sent to you. If they have, let me know more about the depicted items, and whether or not you think any of them should be included in *Truth versus Lies*.

Ulveman is eager to write about you, although not quite as eager as Gary. He came up from Washington, D.C. to meet with me last Sunday. I deflected his attempts at gleaning information from me. While doing this I was able to glean the fact that he is an upstanding individual. This does not mean to say that he is trustworthy (I cannot say one way or the other). But he might be able to do a story that would be difficult for an American journalist simply by dint of the fact the

he is not American. Ulveman is a seasoned journalist, and he should be treated with caution, since it is his job to sell people down the river.

I suggested he explore two stories, but gave him nothing concrete (although, as it turned out, the appeal was leaked in a matter of days). My goal was to give him “harmless” but interesting stories. The first would focus on Burrell. Echoing Mello’s book, I averred that Burrell mismanaged your trial and did not proceed according to the letter of the law, and that there might be an interesting story somewhere in there. The second story was worthy of a Pulitzer Prize, since it had to do with the FBI’s conduct at the time of your arrest. I told him simply to look for wrongdoing that might be waiting to be discovered. I did not give him the impression that I *knew* about any particular example of wrongdoing, but rather that it seemed an obvious story if he had the time to look for leads. He might be able to dig up something that could come in handy when you go back to trial. I also think you might consider corresponding with him. You would be safe doing an interview with him should you ever feel that it would be beneficial to your situation.

I was glad to tell you about Korzenik, who has been my legal counsel from day one. You asked about his change of heart. It was based on his better grasp of the contents of *Truth versus Lies*, and was not informed by any revelation in the field of copyright law. I told Mello that he should have consulted me before bringing in a lawyer to consult on something that is entirely my responsibility as publisher. Goodenough’s field of knowledge lies in entertainment law. This is a rather large field, so I asked Mike about Goodenough’s specific experience in the realm of publishing and copyright, and he could not tell me anything in particular about his expertise. There is some wiggle room in the claim that this professor is “one of the best” in the field of copyright law. Korzenik has practiced law in the field of publishing for twenty years. He is a highly regarded professor of copyright, libel and defamation at Cordoza. I do not know who qualifies as being one of the best. But Korzenik is a name one hears in New York publishing circles. In addition to his legal expertise, he is a very good person.

Korzenik now knows that I have waived the copyright issue because of the difficulties to which the copyright problem has given rise, and the associated delays to the execution of the contract. He does not agree. My insurance company will not cover the book without a clause that allows for necessary legal edits, which includes copyright. I apologize for behaving in such a hasty manner, but the delay in executing the contract makes it impossible to proceed, which I must do. I have no other excuse, and I am disappointed by my behavior. I had thought that you and I would be able to solve any *serious* problems, problems that might incur a lawsuit or injunction, between us ex-contract. If I were wrong, then I would have to handle the lawsuits. Unfortunately, Korzenik informs me that I will not be able to defend myself from lawsuits without insurance, since any damages awarded would put me out of business. As I have said before, Korzenik does not foresee any big problems regarding legal liability in your book. A further assurance, I hope, is that I have demonstrated the consistent intent to maintain the integrity of *Truth versus Lies*.

As for Goodenough's letter, which you have cited, the language is unclear and I understand neither the context nor the logic therein. I will let you know when Korzenik gets back to me about it. Again, I apologize for my rashness, and I hope that we can find acceptable terms.

Vicki Gordon gave me a videocassette with a news report on your brother's bid for a tax exemption for the reward money he received for telling the FBI that you were the Unabomber. I did get the impression that his only interest is winning "approval for himself." I will rely completely on you for advice regarding the manner in which he is to be handled. He would be foolish not to permit the publication of his letters. This is why: He will look very petty, and suspicious, if he does not. If he wants approval, then he must appear to be on the up-and-up.

A week has past since I received the copy of your letter to Greenberg, and I am still not sure what I think. I agree that his impatience is similar to a man waiting to use a toilet (which caused me to laugh aloud). My main concern has been his lack of confidentiality. When the *60 Minutes* people called, I was sure Gary was responsible. His brother is an investigative reporter there. I carefully poked around when I met with Vicki to determine if this was the case. At one point, I said, "I think I know who told you about the motion to appeal." She told me her sources were confidential, but I think she was worried that I did know. The next day, she called to say that she had figured out "who I must be thinking about." She then told me that she had not gotten any information from Gary or his brother. As for how she guessed correctly, she claimed to know that Gary was writing about you. I think her reaction leaves the matter open for interpretation. On a similar note, it appears that Serra made the announcement of your motion to appeal this Friday, but I am still waiting to hear if that's true (and, if so, why).

I called Bonnie on Friday evening as soon as I received your letter informing me that he was your lawyer. I had been waiting for word from you. I was very impressed by him. He possesses a measured and friendly demeanor, and he seems to be highly intelligent. We discussed many things. The main points were timing of publication (no decision yet), the contents of *Truth versus Lies* and the impact it will have on the motion to appeal (I am sending him a copy tomorrow), and *60 Minutes*. Vicki Gordon called me on Friday at 8.30 in the morning to tell me about the *USA Today* story. I had not yet read the papers. She then called Mello and Bonnie. Bonnie seems to think that she is a good person to have involved and that her intentions are good. But he did not have very much to tell her since he is still trying to develop an understanding of the situation. He advised me to give no information out about the motion, which has already been my practice. The topic of an interview with Mike Wallace was broached. Bonnie saw no reason why you should not do it, provided sufficient preparations had been made so that nothing counter to your legal goals would be included in that interview. He also said that he had not decided what to do about Gary in January.

Which brings us back to the question of second-hand information, and the confusion to which it has given rise. It may be that Gary is a man who desperately needs to stand in front of the urinal commonly referred to as the media. I do not doubt it. But it may also be that he is sufficiently toilet trained, and no accidents will occur. This is Bonnie's opinion. I am starting to subscribe to

this point of view myself, but I do not have enough to go on and he has given reason to wonder. I can think of higher crimes and misdemeanors than a tyro author's petulance. He is certainly champing at the bit. But he has a lot to offer. There needs to be more protocol in the arena of information exchange. If I speak to Gary, I will not inform him of the most recent developments, nor will I discuss the subjects you have specified.

Thank you very much for asking whether or not I would be interested in seeing manuscripts from the two writers you mention. I would be interested. I do have room for at least one more title next year.

Regarding my status as an independent publisher you write: "If you would care to tell me anything that would enlighten me, I'd be pleased to hear it."

My first and only job for a corporate publishing house was at Alfred A. Knopf. I worked as a translator at the same time, and I often clocked ninety hours a week. While I was at Knopf, I worked with such authors as Edward Said, Joan Didion, as well as other authors of less renown. Knopf is one of the most distinguished publishers in this country, and I learned a lot there.

The rigid chain of command at Knopf, however, eventually became untenable, and I resigned from my post at Knopf in 1995. I left on good terms, and they knew that I was leaving to start my own venture. As a matter of fact, many of my associates are from Knopf, including the Director of Production, who advises me on a wide range of business issues as well as book production. I decided to start a packaging company for the publishing industry, with the hope that I could develop it into an independent publishing house. The past three years have constituted a formative process that has culminated in a strong publishing venture.

Book packaging is a service, of sorts. I ask publishers if I can create books for them, which they buy outright and publish themselves. It is the A to Z of publishing a book, without the overhead (which is covered by the client). I learned about book packaging at Knopf. Among my responsibilities there were three illustrated book series, you will probably be familiar with one of them, which was the *National Audobon Society Field Guides*. The other two series were, respectively, *Knopf Travel Guides* and a lifestyle series titled *Chic Simple*. The first work I did as a packager was an educational wildlife series for kids and a cookbook series. I contracted these jobs with International Masters Publishers (IMP), where I had been a freelancer for two years. I made adaptations of these works, from Swedish and German respectively, to English for the American market.

This created a good cash flow, and soon IMP gave me more work. I employed five people full-time within three months of starting the company, and was contracted by Knopf, Crown, and the IMP. Six months later I was asked to launch another wildlife program. This was to be in Chinese. I found the people to work on the project (I do not speak Chinese, although I can read some), and began production. I still package things for Crown and IMP, as a matter of fact I have just started working on a new project titled *Monsters*, which is an educational series about "frightening"

creatures from the natural world. The budgets for these projects are often quite large. Context now has more than enough capital to launch six books next year, which has been my goal all along.

What follows is a list of the books that will be published in 1999. You already know about two of the books. I would also like to re-issue the Unabomber's Manifesto (and I am reserving a slot for that eventuality).

The others are less political, but nonetheless important. I am publishing a book of writings by the French poet, painter, physicist Malcolm de Chazal. The "de" stands for wealthy, but his wealth, while surrogate-producing, was not only monetary. The book in question was written during the thirties and forties and is titled *Sens-Plastique*. André Breton said of Chazal, "We have heard nothing so powerful since Lautréamont." The latter, also known as Isidore Ducasse, was a poet who wrote during the 1870s and died young. He was contemporary with Arthur Rimbaud, and is known for his anarchical prose poem titled *Les Chants du Maldoror*.

The fifth may be *The Complete Works of Bruno Schulz*, a Polish novelist, or his novel titled *Street of Crocodiles*. Andrei Platonov, a Russian killed by Stalin early on, is the other candidate for the fifth slot. I would like to publish his novel *Petersburg*, which was written in the twenties and distributed to thousands of readers via *samizdat*, or mimeograph, but did not get published in book form until the late eighties. It is a very good satire, somewhere between Joyce and Aldous Huxley in tone. Replace Huxley with Mikael Bulgakov (*Heart of a Dog*, *Master and Margerita*) or Jaroslav Hasek (*Good Soldier Schweik*) if you are familiar with these works. As it happens, I am looking for someone to do a new translation of *Heart of a Dog* for 2000, which is an anti-Bolshevik satire about a mad scientist who replaces a wino's pituitary gland with the gonads of a dog. This man becomes a dog in every respect but form; a communist dog, as it were. And he is the perfect citizen except for one small item of pathology: He must kill every cat he sees. But this is not a problem. He is given a post: City Cat Catcher. The sixth book is an open slot. I will not know anything further until the manuscript hits my desk.

Thank you for your note regarding money. I hope that you will let me know if you would like me to send funds, or anything else, in the future.

My assistant's name is Travis Taylor. I believe that you will find him to be an efficient and careful person.

As for Chris Waits, I am sure that it must be Houghton Mifflin. Do not be surprised at this press for publishing garbage. My only connections at HM are via acquaintances who would be curious to know how I found out about the book, etc. I will hopefully obtain a copy of the galley soon through alternative routes. If I am successful, I will send it to you. Please find the enclosed news clip from the *New York Post*.

As always, I hope this note finds you well. I will be working during the holidays, so there should not be any disruption in correspondence on this end.

My best,

Beau.

P.S. I have cross-referenced the list of letters you have sent, and all of them have arrived safely (although, as noted, sometimes in a molested state). Here is a list of letters I have sent to you:

12.11 ✓  
12.07 ✓  
12.05 ✓  
11.30 ✓  
11.23 ✓

11.23 ✓  
11.13 ✓  
11.04 ✓  
10.29 ✓  
10.27 ✓

10.26 ✓  
10.26 ✓  
10.22 ✓  
10.21 ✓  
10.20 ✓  
10/14

10.02 ✓  
09.21 ✓  
09.04 ✓  
08.17 ✓  
07.24 6/24

9/24 (handwritten)